

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

02-277

**From:** John Rook  
**To:** Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:17 PM  
**Subject:** Fw: Foreign ownership changes must include broadcasters!

----- Original Message -----

**From:** <darren.macdonald@hrdc-drhc.gc.ca>  
**To:** <JHRook@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 03, 2003 6:20 AM  
**Subject:** re: Foreign ownership changes must include broadcasters!

RECEIVED

MAY - 8 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Good day John. Great story on Art Roberts. I never heard about the cold shoulder you first got at WLS. As for the article from CP, a few comments.

1. Izzy Asper and family are attempting to become the biggest media conglomerate in Canada. They also control directly the editorial pages of all their papers, to the point that local boards cannot publish their own opinions. Prime Minister Chretien has recieved more than a few glowing tributes this way.

2. Bell Globalmedia owns the biggest newspaper in Canada, the Globe and mail,

the #1 TV network CTV, and many CTV local affiliates. A few years ago, they took control of Atlantic Television Systems here, and since, have layed off staff, cut back programing and gotten into more riske type shows. (The Sopranos plays on CTV here)

3. Locally, in New Brunswick, we have 20 private radio stations ( 9 owned by Maritime Broadcasting sysytems, 2 by Newcap, 4 by Astral Media and 5 by the Irving Group of companies, the only ones that are owned by a New Brunswick company. MBS is run from Halifax and consulted heavily by US consultants. Newcap and Astral have changed hands several times in recent years. As for Newspapers, all dailys and most weeklys are owned by Irving. TV is CBC, ATV (Bell Globalmedia) and Global (Izzy Asper). Very little local control in any of it.

If I were you in the US, I'd be very worried. Imagine if Clear Channel controled not only radio and music companies, but almost the entire media of you area. It could happen. It has here, and it is more frightening than you can imagine.

Darren MacDonald

----- Original Text -----

From: "JHRook" <JHRook@earthlink.net>, on 2003-03-02 7:47 PM:

Example of things to come for broadcasting in the US?  
 Make your feelings known at [www.JohnRook.com](http://www.JohnRook.com)

Located online at

<http://www.cp.org/english/online/full/media/030227/X022720AU.html>

-----

---

-

Foreign ownership changes must include broadcasters, CanWest boss says  
 SUE BAILEY

OTTAWA (CP) - More foreign investment wouldn't threaten Canadian content and should be available to all broadcasters, says the head of CanWest Global Communications.

"We think the economic benefits far outweigh the potential and illusory threats to culture," Leonard Asper, president and CEO of Canada's second-largest private broadcaster, told MPs on Thursday. He urged the Commons industry committee to raise or even scrap foreign ownership limits for telecommunications firms - but only if broadcasters get the same treatment.

The all-party committee is to recommend in coming weeks whether to change rules restricting foreigners to minority stakes in Canadian phone companies.

Foreign ownership is now limited to 46.7 per cent for the operating arms of domestic phone and cable TV firms.

Asper argued that overlapping interests mean investment caps can't be lifted for the telecommunications sector alone.

"There are many important competitive linkages among providers of telecommunication services, cable and satellite distributors of broadcast signals," he said.

While satellite companies have said they should be treated the same as telecommunications firms, Asper urged MPs to also include conventional and cable broadcasters.

Canadian content rules would still be enforced by the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC), he stressed.

"They're going to be upheld because licensing depends on it," Asper said.

"The international experience is that foreign companies bend over backwards to show they are good corporate citizens and comply with the rules."

He also downplayed fears that foreign owners would cut Canadian jobs.

"You have to employ local people to put local productions together."

CRTC rules require broadcasters to have an overall Canadian content of 60 per cent on average, and 50 per cent during prime time. In addition, eight hours of "priority Canadian content" - often dramas - must be aired weekly.

CanWest owns the country's largest newspaper chain, including the National Post, forged from the former Southam newspaper group, now called CanWest Publications Inc., and the Global TV Network.

A telecommunications company such as BCE Inc., owner of Bell Telephone, is also in the satellite TV business through Bell ExpressVu. And it holds a majority stake in Bell Globemedia, owner of the Globe and Mail newspaper and CTV - one of CanWest's major broadcasting rivals, Asper said.

**RECEIVED**

MAY - 8 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

In such a climate, excluding CanWest from increased foreign investment "could have a very significant effect on our bottom line."

Smaller companies struggling to compete against telecommunications giants BCE and Telus Corp. have pushed for an end to foreign ownership limits.

They say established firms have access to large reserves of cash, while start-up competitors must fight over limited amounts of risk capital.

Some broadcasters earlier told the committee that foreign limits should be maintained to protect Canadian culture on air.

"CanWest does not subscribe to that narrow and protectionist view," Asper said.

, The Canadian Press, 2003

**RECEIVED**

**MAY - 8 2003**

**Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**

**From:** torilookstwine@earthlink.net  
**To:** James Carville, john.moody, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM  
KJMWEB, mark.effron, mg3, Michael Copps, neal.shapiro, newshour, PeterJennings, walter.isaacson  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:44 PM  
**Subject:** media's charter

[http://www.truthout.org/docs\\_03/050403B.shtml](http://www.truthout.org/docs_03/050403B.shtml)

torilookstwine@earthlink.net  
Why Wait? Move to EarthLink.

[DEFAULT]

BASEURL=[http://www.truthout.org/docs\\_03/050403B.shtml](http://www.truthout.org/docs_03/050403B.shtml)

[InternetShortcut]

URL=[http://www.truthout.org/docs\\_03/050403B.shtml](http://www.truthout.org/docs_03/050403B.shtml)

Modified=C08993A49712C301ED

**From:** J Harvey Herring  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:45 PM  
**Subject:** Protect our free speech rights

I am sending this email urging all of you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect us AMERICAN citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge all of you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Is this not what one hundred thirty-eight of our military people died for in Iraq? I guess Saddam Hussein would like and support this law in his former country. Do not let our people die in vain!

Thank you for supporting our free speech rights!

J. Harvey Herring  
2425 Robbie Lee  
Nesbit, MS. 38651

**From:** Bullboor@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:48 PM  
**Subject:** concentration of ownership

Urge no further relaxing of FCC rules on media ownership concentration until Congressional hearings have been held. Plan to notify my Senators and Congressman.

Hendrik Booraem

**From:** Dale  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 11:07 PM  
**Subject:** FCC Biennial Regulatory Review 2002

I have become aware that a decision will be made on June 2, 2003 that may change the limits for ownership and broadcasting of radio, television, cable etc. Please do NOT change the existing rules. We Americans have lost so many of our freedoms since September 11. We need to maintain freedom of discussion- debate on all sides of the important issues we face in our country.

Allowing large companies to monopolize ownership of our stations and airways would limit the free discourse we have always enjoyed and that is so important in making informed decisions in a democracy.

We need small local stations manned by people who care about their community to be there to keep us informed about issues and events that immediately affect us. The "canned" programs broadcasted from places far from where we live cannot possibly perform this important service.

So maintaining the broadcasting distance limits is vital.

There is also a rule to limit the ownership of a television station and newspaper in the same market. Once again, to present opposing views to important issues, it is vital to maintain this limit.

Please do not continue this perilous downward spiral of losing our precious freedoms.

Very sincerely, Julie Hall, Public School Teacher



**From:** William K. Medlin  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 11:12 PM  
**Subject:** Citizen inputs on Mass Media structuring

Dear FCC Commissioners: Your apparent intent within a month's time to vote on major restructuring of the rules governing the corporate character of electronic communications appears premature and far too expeditious, especially from the perspective of citizen review, study and participation in a process vitally affecting the totality of our nation. In a democratic polity, it is absolutely unthinkable that a Federal agency would proceed to changing the rules whereby the vast public obtains its information, culture, recreation and political ideas which are essential to the commonweal, without due citizen review and due process (cf. US Constitution)

Never in our history has so much power been placed at the disposal of corporate entities whose capacities for controlling, shaping and directing the course of public life -- and these largely for the major, though not exclusive, purpose of selling and buying goods and services. The total commercialization of public media, whose PRIMARY function is to serve the public welfare, will surely lead to greater, not less, concentration of decision making, and to much less range of choice by consumers.

Aside from the power and concentration issue, there is the constant need of smaller states and communities for independent media services that respond to their circumstances. The "tyranny of the majority" (to quote Locke and Rousseau) can be a terrible blight on the aspirations of those who do not wield the financial or political power needed to create and control their information systems, essential to the good functioning of their societies. Here in Idaho, and most of the Northwest territory, we must have more choice and flexibility, even with present modes of media ownership.

Finally, creativity and originality would surely be constrained by rules which encourage more mergers, concentration and centralization -- attributes which are completely alien to pluralistic democracy. "E pluribus unum" has no meaning if the pluribus becomes smothered in the race for "unity", defined as monopolistic consortia controlling what we read, hear and see in our public media -- yes, OUR PUBLIC MEDIA! THE PEOPLE MUST HAVE A VOICE IN THIS MATTER OF FCC RULES CHANGE !!! Please take note.

Respectfully submitted,

William K. Medlin (PhD)

**CC:** Philip Medlin, Delia Medlin

**From:** Mary Brace  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 11:18 PM  
**Subject:** June 2 Deregulation Rulings - Interview Request

Commissioner Kopps,

First, thank you for your efforts to bring public awareness to the next round of proposals, whatever they may be, and get input. I am a broadcaster who started in the radio business in the early-mid '80s, when deregulation first became fashionable, and so am an interested observer into what similar changes may bring to the print & tv industry, in addition to further radio deregulation.

I currently work mornings 6-10 at WRLT-FM, Nashville, TN (<http://wrlt.com>). WRLT is a local, independently owned and operated Class A, "music-intensive" station.

If by any chance, your schedule brings you into this area between now and June 2, I would like to extend an invitation to you to come on the air as my guest, for an interview to discuss the possible changes and what effects various proposals might have if they were to become law, both from an economic standpoint and that of "the public interest, convenience, and necessity."

If this is a possibility, I can be reached at (615) 242-5600 ext 2510 or via return email.

thanks,

Mary Brace

**CC:** [mbrace@wrlt.com](mailto:mbrace@wrlt.com)

**From:** jp@mcb.harvard.edu  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 11:25 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

J Poolner  
General Delivery  
Belmont, Massachusetts 02478

cc:  
Senator Edward Kennedy  
Senator John Kerry  
Representative Edward Markey

**From:** jp@mcb.harvard.edu  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 11:25 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

J Poolner  
General Delivery  
Belmont, Massachusetts 02478

cc:  
Senator Edward Kennedy  
Senator John Kerry  
Representative Edward Markey

**From:** EdibleGRDN@aol.com  
**To:** FCC FCCINFO  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 11:21 AM  
**Subject:** (no subject)

At all costs, the June decision must be delayed until Americans have a full understanding of how devastating the consequences to free speech and access to unbiased news this will bring about. The last decision in 1996 gave rise to such organizations as Clear Channel, now a dominant force in radio, and who represses views which are opposite to its own. In the Iraq war, they organized counter demonstrations to discourage citizen rights to protest. Other transgressions have also occurred because of deregulation, such as: VIACOM's pressure on outspoken recording stars. These things would not have happened if there had been more honest to goodness competition. Business giants have gotten out of hand. They will be far worse, if more deregulation comes about.

New decisions to edregulate further could eventually lead to a corporate "right thinking" attitude in which the consumer is unwittingly fed a continual stream of propaganda in which the government and the corporations look wonderful, no matter what they do. Without other options, with enough repetition of corporate slogans, Americans may become exactly what these monied giants want: unthinking pawns who buy what they're supposed to and who otherwise keep their mouths shut. The FCC is supposed to protect its citizens against monopoly and hold the faith of free speech and access. Let them not forget it.

**CC:** Mike Powell, EdibleGRDN@aol.com

From: TheRiverCat@aol.com  
To: mpowell@fcc.gov  
cc:  
Subject: Broadcast Ownership

Dear Mr. Powell:

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of these corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy debate in our country.

Sincerely,  
Michael C. Conner  
Marion, Ar.

**From:** Con Wisniewski  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 1:00 PM  
**Subject:** impending rule change concerns

Gentlemen,

I wish to register my concerns regarding impending rule changes being contemplated by the FCC. In particular, I have read that within the next 30 days, it is highly possible that the current rules that regulate the media industry could be dramatically altered by the FCC. I am greatly concerned that if current anti-monopolistic regulations are relaxed, then large media corporations could gain control of the industry through acquisition and could strongly bias the flow of news and information towards their own corporate interests.

Any changes regarding these regulations should be openly brought to the general public's attention and a thorough public examination should take place. There should be no hints of secrecy or hidden agendas surrounding the altering of the current rules. Too much is at stake to do otherwise.

Greatly concerned,

Conrad Wisniewski  
48102 Whitney Ct.  
Canton, Michigan 48187  
cwisniewski239928MI@comcast.net

**From:** Slarrydude@wmconnect.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 2:58 PM  
**Subject:** (no subject)

Mr. Powell: I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue to broadcast ownership protection that, for decades, have helped to insure a healthy political debate in our country. Sincerely, Dude Starnes



**From:** Carleton Spotts  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 5:49 PM  
**Subject:** revision of rules

112 times in the Communications Act, Congress used the term "public interest." I am the public; you are the public, my neighbor is the public; CORPORATIONS ARE NOT THE PUBLIC. It is contrary to the obvious intention of Congress and it is contrary to the continuation of our representative democracy to allow small numbers of large corporations to control the media. I am particularly concerned with its news function which already has become monolithic. Please don't expand this policy and thereby create less variety in news coverage. Thank you.

**From:** Janet Gray  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 7:06 PM  
**Subject:** Free the Media

Public airwaves are democracy's best safeguard to freedom. To consolidate our media will silence the voices of a diverse public. Ownership should be more carefully monitored--whereas the proposed ownership changes suggest that a few media giants shall control the American information and education system: a most frightening proposition.

How can I and my concerned friends help prevent this passage?

Sincerely  
Janet Gray  
Tryon, NC

From: Elaine Pawlak  
To: Mike Powell  
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 8:40 PM  
Subject: Freedom of Speech

What can the public do to assure that the public airwaves are not owned by a conglomerate; thus narrowing the views expressed.

We are coming closer and closer to Big Brother.

I am extremely concerned.

Please advise.

Elaine Pawlak

**From:** Candy Simmons  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:56 PM  
**Subject:** change of regulations

Dear Mr. Powell,

It is imperative that more hearings be held regarding the impending change in regulations regarding the increase in private ownership of the airwaves.

The consolidation of many organizations, corporations, and businesses have limited the freedom of choice for Americans. Do not let the consolidation of the airwaves go unchecked without more hearings. Do not limit our information choices.

Our representatives in Congress deserve a chance to have more input on this matter before the June vote.

Sincerely,  
Candace Simmons  
10 Marne Dr.  
Lake St. Louis, Missouri  
63367

---

Get more from the Web. FREE MSN Explorer download : <http://explorer.msn.com>

**From:** Jerry Day  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 12:03 AM  
**Subject:** Media Must Be Competitive and Diverse

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

The FCC must not act to reduce opportunity, choice and quality in media. We are already suffering from excess "consolidation" of media powers to the point where content is severely compromised restricted and biased. Please explain the thinking that allowed the Commission to consider permitting further monopolistic conglomeration in media.

Yes, I would like a response.

Jerry Day  
Burbank, CA

**From:** Sue Diehl  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 12:03 AM  
**Subject:** Media Ownership

Dear Commissioner Abernathy:

Please do not vote to weaken regulation of media ownership. There are already too few owners of the various media in this nation.

Thank you.

--Carol Sue Diehl

5838 Fremont St Apt 3  
Oakland CA 94608-2612

---

STOP MORE SPAM with the new MSN 8 and get 2 months FREE\*  
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

**From:** Carolyn Hallett  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 12:04 AM  
**Subject:** Please vote against deregulation

Hello

I am writing to you to voice my opposition to the changes the FCC's is considering that would deregulate media ownership-limits in local markets.. This change would result in fewer media companies and thus a higher concentration of media control in the hands of a few large corporations.

Democracy is based on a free press, and a FREE press does not result when a small number of large corporation own the media. A free press represents a wide variety of viewpoints. This includes a widely diverse LOCAL perspective. This Diversity of local perspectives would be lost if the critical safeguards that are designed to help ensure diversity of media ownership are ended under the FCC plans. Under these plans, there would be fewer owners of networks, TV and radio stations, and newspapers which would lessen the variety of viewpoints in our media.

It is clear that we need MORE locally owned TV & radio stations and newspapers to protect and ensure our democracy in the United States. Thank you for considering my opinions in this very important matter.

Carolyn Hallett  
Seattle Washington

**From:** Carolyn Hallett  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 12:05 AM  
**Subject:** Deregulation

Hello

I am writing to you to voice my opposition to the changes the FCC's is considering that would deregulate media ownership-limits in local markets.. This change would result in fewer media companies and thus a higher concentration of media control in the hands of a few large corporations.

Democracy is based on a free press, and a FREE press does not result when a small number of large corporation own the media. A free press represents a wide variety of viewpoints. This includes a widely diverse LOCAL perspective. This Diversity of local perspectives would be lost if the critical safeguards that are designed to help ensure diversity of media ownership are ended under the FCC plans. Under these plans, there would be fewer owners of networks, TV and radio stations, and newspapers which would lessen the variety of viewpoints in our media.

It is clear that we need MORE locally owned TV & radio stations and newspapers to protect and ensure our democracy in the United States. Thank you for considering my opinions in this very important matter.

Carolyn Hallett  
Seattle Washington



**From:** Sue Diehl  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 12:08 AM  
**Subject:** Media Ownership

Dear Commissioner Copps:

Thank you for appearing on Now with Bill Moyers. I have written you your fellow commissioners and Chairman Powell, asking them not to vote to weaken regulation of media ownership.

I hope this issue is resolved for the benefit of the nation.

Sincerely

--Carol Sue Diehl

5838 Fremont St Apt 3  
Oakland CA 94608-2612

---

Protect your PC - get McAfee.com VirusScan Online  
<http://clinic.mcafee.com/clinic/ibuy/campaign.asp?cid=3963>

**From:** Carolyn Hallett  
**To:** Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein,  
john\_mccain@mccain.senate.gov  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 12:10 AM  
**Subject:** FCC deregulation

Hello

I am writing to you to voice my opposition to the changes the FCC's is considering that would deregulate media ownership-limits in local markets.. This change would result in fewer media companies and thus a higher concentration of media control in the hands of a few large corporations.

Democracy is based on a free press, and a FREE press does not result when a small number of large corporation own the media. A free press represents a wide variety of viewpoints. This includes a widely diverse LOCAL perspective. This Diversity of local perspectives would be lost if the critical safeguards that are designed to help ensure diversity of media ownership are ended under the FCC plans. Under these plans, there would be fewer owners of networks, TV and radio stations, and newspapers which would lessen the variety of viewpoints in our media.

It is clear that we need MORE locally owned TV & radio stations and newspapers to protect and ensure our democracy in the United States. Thank you for considering my opinions in this very important matter.

Carolyn Hallett  
Seattle Washington

**From:** Martin McClure  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 12:17 AM  
**Subject:** Proposed Changes

As a citizen of the United States I am honored that you have chosen to serve us. I want you to understand that I believe that a free and unfettered press is one of the vital forces maintaining freedom in this great country. Anything which interferes with diversity in the media is a threat to our way of life. The changes which the FCC is proposing will hamper the free exchange of ideas and information as well as quash debate. It will do this by allowing fewer and fewer companies to control our only access to news and information. I understand that you plan to vote for these changes to benefit large media companies and restrict the American people's access to information. Please do not vote yes; reconsider and vote for the people instead of for your pocketbook.

Martin McClure  
1158 Crystal Lake Way  
Lakeport, CA 95453

I am very concerned about the pending changes in regulations that would make it easier for large companies to own several or all media sources in a community. This seems very risky and would serve to limit the amount and variety of information the public would receive. We have enough conflict of issues potential now with companies that own the larger networks. I find it difficult to get any thoughtful discussion unless I read different newspapers and watch Public Broadcasting. I do not support any attempts to allow these regulation changes.

Phyllis Clancy  
34904 SE 6th St.  
Washougal, Washington

**From:** PJC474@aol.com  
**To:** Michael Capps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 12:22 AM  
**Subject:** Media Ownership

**From:** PJC474@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 12:23 AM  
**Subject:** Media ownership

I am very concerned about the pending changes in regulations that would make it easier for large companies to own several or all media sources in a community. This seems very risky and would serve to limit the amount and variety of information the public would receive. We have enough conflict of issues potential now with companies that own the larger networks. I find it difficult to get any thoughtful discussion unless I read different newspapers and watch Public Broadcasting. I do not support any attempts to allow these regulation changes.

Phyllis Clancy  
34904 SE 6th St.  
Washougal, Washington

**From:** Rick  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 12:28 AM  
**Subject:** Consolidation of News

I am very concerned that the 1st amendment is facing a huge challenge when the independence of the news agencies can consolidate so that we won't get both sides of news. This would be the beginning of the end of our great country. Before you vote for this, realize how this will affect the future of our country and the nail this will drive as will be reflected in history. Frederick Sherman